FINAL Community Leaders Meeting Summary - Portland Harbor Superfund Site || Briefing + Discussion with EPA & DEQ Wednesday, June 12, 2019 | The Village Ballroom

Actions	Who?	Status
Distribute a Doodle Poll to schedule the Agenda Subgroup meeting.	Triangle	Complete
Confirm the date of the July Agenda Subgroup meeting.	Triangle	Complete
Distribute the presentation slides from the Community Leaders meeting.	Triangle	By early July
Distribute the meeting summary from the June 12 Community Leaders meeting.	Triangle	By mid-July
Discuss sharing information with community leaders regarding PRPs working in the Portland Common Interest (PCI) group who are working with EPA. Potentially consult with Rich Gold.	EPA Region 10 Leadership	This action item was stated by Sheryl Bilbrey who has since left EPA. Laura Knudsen is working on how EPA will address this action item with Sheryl's departure & plans to provide an update at the 9/11/2019 community leader meeting.
EPA should develop a one-pager that outlines upcoming job opportunities related to workforce and contracting at the Portland Harbor Superfund Site.	EPA Region 10	Laura is considering how this fact sheet could be developed. It also seems that this fact sheet could also have more information on milestones in the design process because this is tied to any potential workforce/contracting considerations. Laura plans to provide an update on this action item at the 9/11/2019 community leader meeting.

Storytelling and Group Discussion, led by Sarah Taylor

The facilitator, Triangle Associates, introduced the topic of storytelling as a recommendation from community leaders following the April 17 meeting. The purpose of the storytelling is **to provide a feeling of connection to the river and emotional satisfaction.**

(b) (6) North Willamette Watershed Council, told the inaugural story. She explained the changing relationship between the river and food. She also talked about how the abundance of food in the river system has changed over the years and has led to a food desert and food insecurity for the historic river communities.

Introductions, led by Triangle Associates

The meeting started with a round of introductions. In total, 14 community leaders were in attendance (*see Appendix A: List of Participants*). They provided their names and affiliations. Sheryl Bilbrey, EPA Region 10 Director, Superfund, and Emergency Management Division, welcomed the group and provided opening remarks to thank the community leaders for their continued effort, investment of time, and dedication to the Portland Harbor Superfund Site.

The facilitator then provided an overview of the meeting agenda, a recap from the April 17 Community Leaders meeting, and thanked the group for their attendance.

Meeting Purpose

An outline of the meeting topics was provided as follows:

- Community Leaders Willamette River storytelling.
- Updates regarding the Community Leaders Subgroup in-between meeting work.
- Site-wide and specific areas at the Portland Harbor Superfund Site, Community Involvement Plan (CIP) and other updates.

Community Involvement Updates

Laura Knudsen, EPA Region 10 Community Involvement Coordinator, provided updates regarding the Community Involvement Plan (CIP), Superfund Job Training Initiative (SuperJTI), the Technical Coordinating Team (TCT), the February 5 Community Leaders meeting, and other community involvement updates.

Community Involvement Plan (CIP) – Laura provided an update about the CIP and noted that the plan is to release a draft of the CIP for public feedback by the end of the year. The plan is to have the draft available for public feedback, Laura also mentioned that she may be reaching out to several Community Leaders regarding the draft CIP.

Superfund Job Training Initiative (JTI) – Laura provided updates regarding the SuperJTI progress. There will be a webinar about the SuperJTI held on Wednesday, August 7 from 6-7:30 pm. The purpose of the webinar is to provide information on the SuperJTI, an overview of how the SuperJTI works, and answer any questions. Laura will start marketing this webinar in early-mid July.

Technical Coordinating Team (TCT) Updates – Laura briefly presented information about the TCT. Laura clarified that the Portland Harbor Technical Coordination Team (TCT) was formed with the execution of the <u>2001 Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) for the Portland Harbor Superfund Site</u> and that parties include Federal, State, and Tribal governments and agencies representing those governments. Laura explained that the purpose of the TCT is to provide a framework for coordination and cooperation in the management of the Site to optimize Federal, State, and Tribal expertise. The <u>TCT slides</u> are now available at the following link: https://semspub.epa.gov/src/document/10/100160150.

February 5 Community Leaders Meeting Recap – Laura briefly discussed a summary table of Key Action Items following the February 5 EPA Senior Leader and Community Leader meeting. The summary table was provided in the <u>April 17 Community Leaders meeting summary</u>. Laura highlighted the sections regarding technology, transparency, air monitoring, and long-term storage of contamination.

Other Updates – Laura reminded participants that there would be an opportunity to speak with the River Mile 11 East group during the evening Public Forum.

Community leaders made comments and posed questions regarding the community involvement updates and EPA provided responses as follows:

- Comment: There was a request that the meeting summaries be translated into five different languages for accessibility. The languages are Spanish; Russian; Vietnamese; Chinese (Cantonese); and Somali.
- **Comment:** There was a request that community leaders be informed of when potentially responsible parties (PRPs) are meeting with EPA leadership and the nature of those meetings.

O1: What can community members do to engage with PRPs that EPA is not actively working with?

A1: The are several legal and allocation challenges that make this difficult. When EPA is in negotiations it is difficult to talk about the nature of what is being negotiated. One option would be to have a special meeting with PRPs who are not in signed agreements with EPA.

Q2: Can we know who is on the list of PRPs that EPA is currently working with? Can the community leaders meet with Rich Gold?

A2: Sheryl Bilbrey stated that EPA Region 10 leadership would talk to Rich Gold about this question.* *Note: This action item was stated by Sheryl Bilbrey who has since left EPA. Laura Knudsen is working on how EPA will address this action item with Sheryl's departure & plans to provide an update at the 9/11/2019 community leader meeting.

Q3: What are EPA's rules regarding long-term storage of contamination?

A3: EPA's follows the Off-Site Rule. This Off-site Rule requires that Superfund wastes may only be placed in a facility operating in compliance with Federal or State requirements. EPA's role is to verify that facilities selected by PRPs for waste disposal are in compliance with those requirements.

Q4: If we discover that there are facilities that are not following the rules of dumping, is there a route to EPA? **A4:** The state performs inspections and approvals of those landfills. If a facility does not meet the Off-Site Rule, then EPA will not allow CERCLA hazardous waste to be disposed of there. Remedial waste will go to permitted landfills that follow permitting processes.

Community Leaders Subgroup Updates and Discussion

The facilitator introduced (b) (6) , Linnton Neighborhood Association, to present an update on the subgroup work completed since the April 17 meeting. (b) (6) introduced a new proposal for the Community Leaders Group to consider. The proposal presented by (b) (6) included six new recommended changes to the existing Community Leaders' Group to help meet the goal for thorough and timely information. For an overview of the proposal document, please view Attachment B of this document.

Following the presentation from (b) (6), the facilitator introduced Jackie Calder, Chair of the Portland Harbor Community Advisory Group (CAG), to present recommended goals that the CAG could achieve to move the Community Leaders' Group forward. Jackie presented four main goals that the CAG hopes can be used to coordinate the efforts of the Community Leaders' Group and Public Forum going forward. The goals presented can be found on page two of the proposal document (link above).

The facilitator reminded the community leaders that each of the proposed recommendations was created by the Community Leader's Subgroup and were in the draft proposal form. Additionally, the facilitator reminded the group to direct questions to the Subgroup members. In response to the information shared in the presentation and regarding the CAG goals the Community Leaders made comments and posed questions regarding the following topics in **bold.**

- **Comment:** In support of the proposal there was a statement that the proposal meets the interests and needs of the full group.
- **Comment:** Information was shared regarding the potential for grant funding to get student interns involved in the cleanup.
- **Comment:** There was a statement in support of the proposal and the idea of expanding the Community Leaders group on occasion.
- **Comment:** There was a suggestion that having potentially responsible parties (PRPs) attend meetings would be a fantastic opportunity for dialogue and having conversations amongst the Community Leaders and PRPs.

Q1: Are the arts included in the education goal?

A1: One of the community leader subgroup members stated that yes, there is an opportunity for the arts to be included in the education goal. Each of the goals can be revised.

Q2: Can there be a physical location or a brick and mortar space for future meetings?

A2: Another community leader subgroup member said that there is an effort by external groups to find a brick and mortar location to hold future meetings.

Q3: Would individuals have to join the CAG committee to participate in the steering meetings?

A3: One of the community leader subgroup members responded with no, and the CAG name is a placeholder for now. There is still time to name the meetings for whatever makes sense for the group.

Q4: What is the purpose of the Portland Harbor CAG, and the role of the CAG in the community involvement process for the Superfund Site?

A4: Another community leader subgroup member said that the Portland Harbor CAG does help support community involvement for the EPA Portland Harbor Superfund Site. However, the CAG is not funded, nor is it sponsored by the EPA.

Q5: Can someone elaborate more about how these meetings are a one-way form of information?

A5: One of the community leader subgroup members stated that the opportunities for public comment are described in regulations for both DEQ and EPA. The opportunities are very specifically outlined. Most of the formal EPA public comment opportunities have passed, meaning the only time that EPA is required to take and consider public feedback is just before EPA and Department of Justice (DOJ) initiate a new consent decree. This means that the information in the current community leaders' meetings follows a one-way format because there are limited opportunities for comments to influence the Superfund Cleanup process.

Following the question and answer and open discussion portion regarding the proposed recommendations and the proposed CAG goals, the facilitator asked whether the community leaders could support what the subgroup proposal included. Community Leaders were invited to share whether they could support the proposed recommendations and goals and to express any concerns. The Community Leaders stated concerns regarding the following topics in **bold.**

- Name: Several community leaders mentioned a desire to change the name of the CAG Steering Committee
 meeting since the proposal suggests the CAG would be the leading group (or the "umbrella"). At the same time
 members of the community leaders' subgroup supported changing the name of the meeting to "CLG Agenda
 Subgroup."
- **Proposal Tracking:** One community leader expressed concern with keeping track of the two different proposals presented: (1) on April 17, and (2) the proposal presented at this meeting. They suggested that proposals need to be compared and revisited before moving forward on a decision. Other community leaders mentioned that the proposal was not static and could still be modified.
 - One community leader reminded attendees that the April 17 proposal was not received by all; however, some community leaders stated that the previous proposal could have been modified to incorporate the concerns shared.
- **Voting:** One community leader stated discomfort coming to a decision on the proposal presented since there is not a clear decision-making process for the Community Leaders' Group.
- **Group Structure:** One community leader stated that having more formality in the structure of the group and the meetings would be helpful.

The facilitator summarized where she thought the group landed: that the proposal presented during this meeting did not meet all the needs or address all concerns shared and that the community leaders group cannot support it going forward as-is. She suggested that since there have been two proposals developed by subgroup members, without consensus

support, that the Community Leaders Group develop an "Agenda Subgroup" - which was one element of the proposal provided during this meeting - to ensure that the future Community Leaders Group meetings are shaped by those attending them. Community Leaders supported this idea and volunteers for the Agenda Subgroup were invited to sign-up. Several individuals volunteered to participate in the Agenda Subgroup to begin preparing for the September 11 meetings.

Presentation: Site-wide and Specific-Area Updates, led by Sean Sheldrake, EPA

This agenda topic was led by Sean Sheldrake, EPA Region 10 Remedial Project Manager, who provided a site-wide overview and specific area updates. Sean referenced a Portland Harbor Superfund Site Update map provided by EPA which indicated several site-wide updates since the April 17, 2019 meeting.

In the Gasco/Siltronic area, EPA is moving into the data gap field data collection portion during this summer. The goal is to fulfill the needs of 100% design to move forward.

Baseline sampling update, the report is expected on June 17, 2019. EPA expects to include all the remaining data, data analyzed over the past 6-9 months in the analysis about what the data meets and/or does not meet. EPA has not received the last round of surface water data yet.

The rest of the Willamette River is undergoing discussions, to make sure that those areas move into a design process. Community leaders made comments and posed questions. EPA provided responses as follows:

- **Comment:** There was a suggestion made to determine education strategies that would build the capacity of the community to be able to provide feedback in the future.
- **Comment:** There was a request for a one-pager to be produced that outlines upcoming job opportunities related to workforce and contracting at the Portland Harbor Superfund Site.
- **Comment:** There was a request that the jobs forecast be shared sooner rather than later to give community members more opportunity to prepare for potential jobs.

Q1: When these sites reach 100% remedial design will there be a public comment period?

A1: There is no public comment period during the remedial design process. However, in terms of community involvement, EPA would like to stop and check-in to get feedback from community members about the status of the design at all specific cleanup areas where EPA has agreements in place with PRPs. At a minimum, EPA would like to do collect community feedback at least once during the design process for each specific cleanup area where community member feedback would have the most impact.

Q2: When can EPA share the workforce and contracting forecast?

A2: EPA can get information regarding the workforce and contracting forecast as the Superfund Site gets closer to the 100% design mark for all specific cleanup areas. This may take a lot of time (years), based on the length of negotiations.

Q3: Does the EPA have proposed scenarios about what the public could potentially comment on before moving beyond 30% design?

A3: One example where community feedback could be helpful early in the design process is the amount/location of dredging and capping proposed for active cleanup areas.

Q4: Do the community leaders have to wait until the 100% design is complete in order to learn about jobs and share the information with community members?

A4: EPA plans to keep community members informed throughout the remedial design process (not just at the 100% design mark when the design is complete) at all the specific cleanup areas. EPA plans so share any relevant job information with community members that we can share.

Environmental Justice Overview Presentation

The facilitator introduced Sheryl Stohs, EPA Region 10 Environmental Justice Community Liaison, to provide an EJ Update: Environmental Justice Screening and Inquiry of Portland Harbor Superfund Site; <u>EJ Screen</u> and supporting resources:

- Environmental Justice definition and overview
- Time Line of Screening/Inquiry for Environmental Justice for the Portland Harbor Superfund site
- Changing demographics from 2006-2010 American Community Survey and 2010 Census to the updated American Community Survey 2012-2016
- Using the EJ Screening Tool Interactive Website and the Mobile version for characterizing the environmental issues around superfund sites
- Exploring housing and schools in close proximity to Portland Harbor
- The importance of community ground-truthing, local knowledge and its impact on the issues affecting the community.

Q1: When discussing changing demographics, how are already displaced communities being considered and included moving forward?

A1: Whenever demographics are discussed, it is important to consider how the census data has changed over time, and what the census data shows.

Q2: Is it possible to add displaced people and communities to the EJ screen?

A2: This might be a question to ask the Center for Disease Control (CDC) or the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ASTDR).

The facilitator announced that since several topics had gone over time, any additional questions for Sheryl Stohs could be addressed after the meeting one-on-one.

Wrap Up and Reminder of Public Forum

The next Community Leader Briefing meeting will be held on Wednesday, September 11, 2019 (location TBD).

ATTACHMENT A - Community Leaders in Attendance

Community Leader	Affiliation	In Attendance?
(b) (6)	African American Breastfeeding Coalition	
(b) (6)	Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon	
(b) (6)	Audubon Society of Portland	
(b) (6)	Audubon Society of Portland	
(b) (6)	Cathedral Park Neighborhood Association	
(b) (6)	Confluence Center	
(b) (6)	CRITFC	
(b) (6)	CRITFC	
(b) (6)	East European Coalition	
(b) (6)	East European Coalition	✓
(b) (6)	Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon	
(b) (6)	Get Hooked Foundation	
(b) (6)	Get Hooked Foundation	
(b) (6)	Immigrant & Refugee Community Organization (IRCO)	
(b) (6)	Iraqi Society of Oregon	
(b) (6)	Iraqi Society of Oregon	
(b) (6)	Kenton Neighborhood Association	
(b) (6)	Korean American Coalition	
(b) (6)	Latino Network	
(b) (6)	League of Women Voters	✓
(b) (6)	League of Women Voters	
(b) (6)	Linnton Neighborhood Association	V
(b) (6)	NAACP - Portland Chapter	
(b) (6)	Native American Youth Association	
(b) (6)	Native American Youth Association	
(b) (6)	Native American Youth Association	
(b) (6)	North Willamette Watershed Council	✓
(b) (6)	Occupy St. Johns	✓
(b) (6)	Old Town Community Association	
(b) (6)	Oregon Bass and Panfish Club	
(b) (6)	Oregon Chinese Consolidated Benevolent Association	
(b) (6)	Oregon Community Health Workers Association (ORCHWA)	
(b) (6)	Oregon Inter-Tribal Breastfeeding Coalition	
(b) (6)	Oregon Tradeswomen	
(b) (6)	Overlook Neighborhood Association	
(b) (6)	Overlook Neighborhood Association and Hazelnut Grove	
(b) (6)	Overlook Neighborhood Association and Hazelnut Grove	
(b) (6)	Portland Harbor Community Advisory Group (CAG)	✓
(b) (6)	Portland Harbor Community Advisory Group (CAG)	✓

Community Leader	Affiliation	In Attendance?
(b) (6)	Portland Harbor Community Coalition	*
(b) (6)	Portland Harbor Community Coalition	
(b) (6)	Portland Harbor Community Coalition	✓
(b) (6)	Portland North East Neighborhood Association	
(b) (6)	Right 2 Survive	✓
(b) (6)	Russian Oregon Social Services	
(b) (6)	Sauvie Island Grange	✓
(b) (6)	Sierra Club	✓
(b) (6)	Sierra Club	
(b) (6)	Sierra Club	
(b) (6)	Somali American Council of Oregon	
(b) (6)	Somali American Council of Oregon	
(b) (6)	St. Johns Neighborhood Association	
(b) (6)	Verde	
(b) (6)	Vietnamese Community of Oregon	
(b) (6)	Village Coalition - The City Repair Project	✓
(b) (6)	Willamette River Advocacy Group	✓
(b) (6)	Willamette River Advocacy Group	
(b) (6)	Willamette Riverkeeper	
(b) (6)	Wisdom of the Elders	
(b) (6)	Wisdom of the Elders	
(b) (6)	Wisdom of the Elders	
(b) (6)	Yakama Nation Fisheries	
(b) (6)	Yakama Nation Fisheries	
(b) (6)	Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs	√

ATTACHMENT B – Proposal from the Community Leaders' Subgroup (Post-April 17th, 2019 Community Leader Group Meeting)

Changes to the Community Leaders' Group

To meet our goals as community leaders, let's make better use of the Community Leaders' Group (CLG), the Public Forums, and the Portland Harbor Community Advisory Group (CAG)

Goal: Get thorough and timely information—information the general public needs, before they need it—about the Superfund Cleanup processes to ensure public awareness of plans, of potentially hazardous conditions, and of opportunities for feedback regarding choices and actions proposed in the Cleanup processes.

Venues for community leaders to get information:

- •The Portland Harbor Community Advisory Group (CAG) is solely responsible for the monthly CAG meetings.

 The CAG is a 501c3 nonprofit. It can offer a wide variety of public education and involvement activities and will hold their monthly meetings in various accessible locations around the city.
- •The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) are responsible for coordinating the quarterly Community Leader Group meetings and Public Forums.

 The CAG joins EPA and DEQ in presenting these venues for information.

The CAG offers community leaders a wide variety of information-receiving and -disseminating avenues. However, CLG meetings and Public Forums are for **one-way communication only: from EPA and DEQ to us.** These events are sponsored by EPA and DEQ as information-dispensing channels to the public about the Superfund Cleanup process. CLG meetings and the Public Forums are *not* venues in which EPA, DEQ, PRPs, or any other governmental or private group is required to pay heed to our feedback. They are required to tell us what they're doing, not to take action on what we think they should be doing.

Proposal: Make Changes to the Existing Community Leaders' Group

EPA and DEQ are open to changes to help us meet our goal for thorough and timely Information. The following are the changes we recommend:

- 1) Expand who is included in the Community Leaders' Group now: Invite new groups, such as health representatives, youth, tribal members, and climate change, environmental justice, and political groups, and add groups as needed in the future. (Triangle will educate new members on the Superfund Cleanup, the Community Leaders' Group, and CAG).
- 2) Expand who provides information to us: e.g., ask the EPA and DEQ to extend invitations to PRPs to make presentations regarding their design plans, upland feasibility studies, upland proposed alternatives and on-going remediation work; use the Public Forums and CAG meetings for general interest presentations.
- 3) Coordinate the agendas for the three different types of meetings available to us (i.e., the monthly CAG meetings and the quarterly CLG and Public Forums): Use the existing CAG Steering Committee (meets monthly; can include all interested community leaders and EPA and DEQ representatives) to set the agendas for all CAG meetings, CLG meetings, and Public Forums, so there is a steady, coordinated flow of information, presented in the appropriate venue.
- 4) With EPA/DEQ, schedule when we want specific types of information (e.g., rolling schedule of DEQ feasibility studies) and in which format(s) that information would be most useful to us (e.g., posted online, weekly email updates).
- 5) Ask EPA/DEQ to provide support for video-taping and live-streaming Public Forum and CAG-sponsored public presentations, so that CLG members have long-term access to these presentations, to share with their groups and the public when appropriate.
- **6) Publicize any Public Comment Periods that regarding or related to the Superfund cleanup** through the CLG members and their groups.

Using the Portland Harbor Community Advisory Group (CAG): Meeting Community Leader Goals Outside the Community Leader Group

With CLG member participation, the Portland Harbor Community Advisory Group (CAG) can encompass our additional goals: CAG can spearhead our Superfund public involvement.

Goal: Educate ourselves and the public The CAG will invite experts to educate us on topics outside the scope of EPA/DEQ (e.g., the TAG Grant Expert Consultant, and experts on health studies and assessments, toxic waste disposal options, source control, climate change, earthquakes, biodiversity challenges, environmental justice, flooding, etc.). To better accommodate the public and the CLG members, the CAG will vary their meeting location each month.

Recommendation: Use the CAG meetings and Public Forums to do this. CAG has offered public education meetings for many years. With live-streamed and video-taped presentations, we can reach new segments of the public. Community leaders will be able to access these presentations in the future, to share with their groups and with the public.

Goal: Initiate and encourage public education or action when useful or necessary Initiate and encourage public education programs (e.g., citizen science projects in cleanup areas) and public action (e.g., large-group request to legislators for a Health Impact Study around the Superfund site) regarding proposed decisions or current work by public and private entities.

Recommendation: The CAG can be the umbrella for activities such as these if CLG members support the CAG through active participation.

Goal: Establish and use our news and social media muscle
The only power we have comes from our ability to rouse public sentiment, instigate public action, and work with our legislators and other politicians—thereby creating public pressure on the agencies and private interests—and we can best do that with the help of the news and social media. Let's use media to share expert presentations, broadcast specific pieces of information, and promote activities or action in the general public.

Recommendation: The CAG can do media outreach within its existing structure, with additional support.

Goal: Insert ourselves into early stages of the Cleanup planning processes, to ensure we give timely feedback. Public pressure and influence are always necessary, early and throughout the process. Often the agencies' final Public Comment Periods are the only time important issues get media and public attention. We can attempt to give public agencies and private interests CLG and public feedback *early in the process*, too, while the decision-making is happening, before public agencies and private interests are already invested in a specific plan.

EPA's public feedback opportunities: There are no required periods for the EPA to take real public comment—that is, comment which will actually influence anything important—in the Superfund Cleanup process. EPA may ask neighborhood groups when to schedule construction activities, but the only required public comment period during the Superfund Cleanup process are the 30-day periods offered before the DOJ and EPA sign a Consent Decree (and Remedial Action work begins) for each cleanup area, but community feedback likely won't have any impact at that point unless it's about liability.

DEQ's public feedback opportunities: After the PRPs (for a project) complete a Feasibility Study (FS), DEQ may require a revised FS or additional materials to address specific concerns or deficiencies. (DEQ does **not** usually—but will consider if we ask—offering a public presentation of the FS.) DEQ typically relies on the options in the FS to choose their proposed "recommended remedial action," in light of DEQ's Rules governing this process. After DEQ prepares a Staff Report outlining their recommended remedial action, they offer a 30-day public comment period, which may include community meetings, etc. After considering all comments, DEQ issues a Record of Decision outlining the "selected remedial action" for the project.

Recommendation: We can use the CAG to do this, if CLG members are willing to participate.

We will have to **create our own opportunities** to give public feedback *at the beginning of these processes*. Let's determine the best way to provide *effective*, *early-on* feedback by setting good practices for our relationships with public agencies and private interests *now*. The CAG can ask agencies and PRPs to make presentations about their proposed decisions, specifically in order to give them our *unsolicited* feedback in a structured and recorded venue (with media coverage possible). For example,

- 1) we can request a presentation from EPA on the Design Guidance Document for PRPs. (Once the Document is completed, PRPs will be required to use these guidelines in the design phase of their projects. The Document may be revised as the cleanup proceeds, which may provide an avenue for future *unofficial* public comment.)
- 2) we can request another presentation from DEQ (after the PRPs finish the addendum requested by DEQ) regarding the Port's and Metro's Willamette Cove Feasibility Study (WCFS) for upland work when the DEQ is starting its review.